

of a given extraction target image, or a judging if a projection display apparatus is in a specific operating condition.

Turning to the anticipation rejection of Claims 11-13, 16-21, 23, and 24, it is noted that Orita cannot be considered to be an anticipating reference because it neither teaches nor suggests the "projection optical system" of independent Claims 11 and 23, the operation condition judging section of independent Claim 18, the judging step of independent Claim 24, the extraction section of independent Claim 20, the extraction step of independent Claim 23, or the operational condition judging a section of independent Claim 21.

Accordingly, as each of these independent claims has subject matter not taught by Orita, the rejection thereof and that of the claims dependent thereon (12, 13, 16, and 17) is respectfully traversed.

With further regard to independent Claims 11 and 23, it is noted that Orita discloses a CRT at col. 14, lines 17-26, not anything that can be reasonably called a "projection optical system," much less the "electro-optical device for emitting light to form images in response to the image display signals" of independent Claim 11.

Furthermore, Orita is concerned with a character extraction unit relative to an image processing apparatus used for inspecting defects and extracts using a segmentation means 24 that binarizes a multi-gray-level image into a binary image. Note col. 5, lines 19-24 and Figure 1. This inspection apparatus is utilized by an operator to observe and inspect the binary image obtained.

On the other hand, a projection display apparatus as recited in independent Claims 11, 23, and 18, can be used for a presentation to an audience and enables the audience to observe an extraction image.

With further regard to independent Claim 20, this claim again requires an image

extraction section that has been limited to extracting "by cutting away" at least a portion of an extraction target image. There clearly is no "by cutting away" taught relative to the segmenting means 24 or any other part of Orita.

Turning to independent Claims 18 and 24, while the Abstract of Orita speaks of condition determination means to determine the condition for the characteristic extraction unit based on density distribution characteristic of the input image in the designated area, this is not seen to be a reasonable teaching relating to the operating condition judging section of Claim 18 that judges if the projection display apparatus is in a specific operating condition or the judging step of Claim 24 that again relates to the projection display apparatus being in a specific operating condition. See col. 5, lines 42-46 and col. 5, line 62-col. 7, line 43 as well as the showings of Figs. 1-4.

With regard to independent Claim 21, the condition determination of Orita determines conditions for binarizing (see Abstract, col. 5, lines 42-46, col. 5, line 62-col. 7, line 43, Figs. 1-4, as noted above). Once again, there is no operating condition judging section that can judge if the image display apparatus is in any specific condition as required by Claim 21.


Turning to the rejection of Claims 14, 15, and 22, it is first noted that Claim 22 is grouped with Claims 1-10 in the Restriction Requirement and was not elected in the response filed on September 26, 2002. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 22 is believed to be moot as Claim 22 should be listed as withdrawn along with Claims 1-10.

With regard to Claims 14 and 15, it is noted that JP 4-205476 cures none of the deficiencies noted above as to Orita. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims is traversed for the reasons noted above relative to parent Claim 11.

In light of the foregoing, it is believed that no other issues remain outstanding in this application, such that it is believed that this application is clearly in condition for formal allowance and, accordingly, and early and favorable action to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER AND NEUSTADT, P.C.


Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Attorney of Record
Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.
Registration No. 40,440



22850

(703) 413-3000
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

GJM:RFC/bwt
I:\atty\rfc\194715us-am.wpd